

MM87-268

From: <FreshGoat@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/6/96 2:05pm
Subject: Digital TV

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20541

Reed E. Hundt
Chairman, FCC

Mr. Hundt:

It is my understanding that leaders of the television broadcast industry are interested in phasing out the current analog transmission system in favor of a better digital system. I am excited by the prospects of newer digital technology, although I hope it will not simply be a fancier version of the mind-numbing reception we now have.

The Internet is really the model for the future -- where individuals interact with each other on either personal or business level, not merely as consumers but also as producers. The big corporations fear the Internet will take their profits but this fear is unfounded. Every new form of communications freedom makes everyone richer and more educated.

Any new digital television network must respect the RIGHT of citizens to complete privacy. That means there must be control over monitoring which programs people watch, when, etc. Pay per view must not be allowed to become the norm. Advertising has worked well since the beginning of TV and gives us freedom; pay per view means we'll be monitored at every turn. We will resist this in every case.

Digital communications must be protected by secure, strong encryption which the U.S. ITAR currently restricts. Without privacy in communications, everything breaks down and Big Brother will have only peasants to watch.

Finally, the current analog system should continue running indefinitely until it is no longer profitable or widely used. No new system should replace the current one (which is tested, tried, and functions well) -- rather, the new systems should complement and augment the current one until new technologies and systems are tested in the real world.

Sincerely,
Jon Jensen
P.O. Box 683
Provo, Utah 84603-0683
Tel. 801-371-0708

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

From: Keith H. Stirling <KHS@HBLL1.byu.edu>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/5/96 1:01pm
Subject: Digital/Analog TV Debate

To: Reed E. Hundt, Chairman, Federal Communications Commission
1919 M St. NW, Washington, D.C. 20554-0001.

MM 37-268
RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

I would like to express my concern about the proposal currently before the FCC by the broadcasting industry to switch TV broadcasting from analog to digital. I am aware of the higher quality transmission that can arise with digital signals. However, my greatest concern with the switch to digital-only signals is the public media censorship that would arise.

First, digital transmission provides broadcasters total control over who may view their signal--thus enabling strict pay-for-viewing scenarios. Money talks. Even though "free" digital channels may be provided by law, the programming quality of these would become inferior. The competitive pressure upon public broadcasting stations is going to continue--particularly with "Pres. Clinton's latest budget-balancing plan calling for \$13 billion to be wrung somehow from TV-band auctions in the next seven years." The economically disadvantaged--those who most need exposure to the highest quality programming--would be selectively excluded.

Secondly, the requirement to convert present analog receivers to digital would impact the consumer not simply in direct costs to convert their own receivers, but also in pass-through costs for education, medical services, communication, transportation, banking, public utilities, etc.

The estimated 200 billion dollars required to convert our present analog receivers to digital would be far better spent in reducing our national debt. That figure represents an average of \$766 from every American that could be used for budget-balancing.

Keith H. Stirling

Keith H. Stirling
Harold B. Lee Library Tel: (801) 378-6687
Brigham Young University Fax: (801) 378-6708
Provo, UT 84602 Email: Keith_Stirling@byu.edu

No. of Copies rec'd
List ABCDE

1

MM87-268

From: <jerpl@wln.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/4/96 4:20pm
Subject: TV Industry

I feel the plan to replace the current transmission system will be very devastating to the consumers. There is no way that the majority of the people can afford to replace their television sets. Also I feel that they should not be allowed to have a "free" channel for 15 years. That will be an expense for American's that can be well used elsewhere. Please reconsider this proposal. Susan Jacobsen jerpl@wln.com

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

From: Kristen Michelle Cox <kcox@hdvision.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/4/96 11:58am
Subject: High Definition Television

I strongly support and look forward to the integration of High Definition Television into consumer's homes. Thank you for your continued efforts in the advancement of this new technology.

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

From: Robert Frazier <rfrazier@mail.coin.missouri.edu>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/7/96 5:42pm
Subject: HDTV

Dear Sirs,

I would like to ask our or two questions about digital television. I am a big fan of digital communications as you may be able to tell by this email. I fail to understand how HDTV will help the public consumer, such as me. Could you explain how I will benefit? Why is it better that analog television which is what we currently have? Is it worth the difference in price to the public?

I favor progress...digital communications is that. However, the stress on the public financially is enormous. Politicians continue to spend more and more money, which is a grater tax burden to us, the public. They seem to ignore our wishes. I would like to see this issue carefully thought out. Do you actually believe that each household will rush out to purchase a new HDTV or two...to replace what he has? Do you actually believe that the average American can afford it? I think that our money could be spent in better choices...such as tax relief, balancing the budget so as to not burden our children further...something that the Mr. Clinton seems unable to comprehend in an election year, and perhaps education. Please convince me that I should really want HDTV...until then, I am totally satisfied with the analogue variety.

Thank in advance for listening...I would love to hear your comments.

Sincerely,

Robert E. Frazier, M.D.

"Foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of small minds"

Robert E. Frazier
367 Crown Point
Columbia, MO 65203 rfrazier@mail.coin.missouri.edu

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

MM 87-268

From: <Oldgeo@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/7/96 4:28pm
Subject: New TV Channels

Neither my wife nor I are in favor of giving the TV Broadcasters free additonal TV Channels. They will make a fortune off of these channels and should have to bid for them the same as the cellular telephone and pager industries. Rep. Jack Fields has stated "it is important we move into the digital age", but it is not important that we change the TV broadcast system so as to make the millions of existing TV sets obsolete or requiring the purchase of a converter, which will not improve to quality of the picture.
Mr. & Mrs. R. C. Walther

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE

MM87-268

From: ERIC D. BISHOP <ST4LH@Jetson.UH.EDU>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/7/96 4:02pm
Subject: Digital Television

To Whom it May Concern,

I was just reading an article about digital television and the government in the Houston Chronicle. I would like to voice my opinion against this idea. While it would be great to get better television reception, the amount of money this would cost the government and the television consumer is not worth the return.

Also, this would hurt the sales of televisions over the next few years, as people would not buy new televisions knowing they will become obsolete over the next few years. This will hurt the economy as many stores will close due to this fact and will result in layoffs of many regular employees. Also, this is not fair to people

This change will also hurt individuals barely able to make ends meet.

They will not be able to afford new televisions or convertors and will be without television reception. Americans have become dependant on their television sets for more than entertainment. They watch the news reports, some of which are vital to every day living. The Emergency

Broadcast System also sends information via Television signal. This could be very costly to Human life, if people can not get the reports from the EBS.

The list of negatives can go on and on while the only real positive is better television reception. Please consider the negatives before also allowing the continuation of Digital TV. Do we really need to spend hundreds of billions of dollars to see better television pictures.

After all, the US is the leader in Television Broadcasting Technologies, what is the hurry. Let the private Sector pick up the bill for this if they want it, not the FCC, Government, or the individuals.

Thank you for your time.

Eric Bishop

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

MM 87-268

From: Calvin Blakley <cblakley@ix.netcom.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/7/96 4:01pm
Subject: HDTV and gift of air space to networks

Dear Sir/Madam:

I read in the New York Times today that there is pressure upon you to give away frequencies to the networks for the purpose of fostering the growth of high definition television. As far as I am concerned the frequency spectrum belongs to the public and should not be given away. For the same reason that we require oil companies to license the right to drill for oil in public places, we should auction or otherwise license the frequencies to the networks.

I would have thought that the networks would have learned by now that acceptance of new technology is software, not hardware, driven. Newer, higher definition, expensive tv's will not be bought by consumers unless it provides more channels or programs not available by other means. It will likely go the way of Sony's Beta format. Better, but nothing much on it.

Calvin Blakley
2007 Wilderness Point Drive
Kingwood, TX 77339

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

MM 87-268

From: MS SANDRA J COULTER <JNAB90A@prodigy.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/7/96 3:45pm
Subject: Digital TV

-- [From: Sandra J. Coulter * EMC.Ver #2.10P] --

I just read the news article in our Houston Chronicle concerning the costs involved in converting TV's in America from analog to digital. I would support the conversion as long as the following issues were addressed for the public.

1. Conversion take place over a period of time to allow people to migrate to digital TV's as their old ones wear out. I realize this places a burden on the broadcasters, but I feel they can come up with a workable plan for both their interests and the public if they really want to.
2. Digital TV's should not go through major technological changes as quickly as the PC technology. It seems that as soon as we learn a new PC system, software and hardware, both have changed and a great deal of cost and training time is expended by the user. I should hope that technology as advanced enough now that digital TV's can enter the market place with a great deal of sophistication.
3. I do not think broadcasters should be the only driving force to make this move. We, the People, must be considered and have representation. I admit I do not fully understand the issues of auctioning access to airwaves, but the end result should be the best economical plan for the Country.

I wish to thank you for your interest in letting the public have a voice in this important event. It seems that so many of our laws, regulations, etc. are controlled by business, lawyers, and the lobbyists who represent narrow interests.

Sincerely,

Sandra J. Coulter

JAN 19 1996

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

From: William Lewis/IC&S/Ashland Chemical/US
<William_Lewis/IC&S/Ashland_Chemical/US%ASHCHEM@notesgw.compuserve.com>
To: fccinfo <fccinfo@fcc.gov>
Date: 1/7/96 3:36pm
Subject: Digital TV

I, as an individual, do not believe that the new digital TV technology should be forced down the throats of the American consumer. This appears to be a very expensive piece of hardware that many people will not be able to afford, especially those who are retired and/or are on fixed income. The people who can least afford this expense are the ones that rely on TV for the majority of their entertainment and information. New technology is wonderful, but not at the expense of a public that cannot afford the investment in new, very expensive equipment. You should force the broadcasters to transmit analog until the prices of the new TV's are within the range of affordability of everyone, which they will be eventually. Just look at what's happened to computer prices.

Bill Lewis

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

From: <JBSewell@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/17/96 9:15pm
Subject: Digital TV

Go ahead and give TV broadcasters a second 6 megahertz channel free if, big IF, they provide converters to conventional sets at low cost, say \$50 each. Forget the bull stuff about replacing TV sets every 5 to 8 years. Make it 10 to 20 years. My youngest set (of 4) is ten years old and doing fine. The oldest is 22 years old and works satisfactorily (most of the time). A question though. If it takes a 35 inch TV to benefit from digital broadcast, of what use is it to those of us who can't hawk up a couple of thousand dollars for a big set a have to struggle along a piddling little 29 incher? And, is there any way to make only the big set owners pay if only they benefit.

RECEIVED

JAN 19 1996

TELETYPE UNIT
COMMUNICATIONS SECTION
FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

From: Schmitz, Suzanne <suzanne@msmail.co.harris.tx.us>
To: FCC <fccinfo@fcc.gov>
Date: 1/17/96 12:12pm
Subject: Reed Hunt, Chairman

MM 87-268
RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996

I was shocked to learn that the TV stations get their airwaves for free.

Now they want more airwaves for free, while demanding that we, the consumer, are obliged to buy a new 35" TV to receive their new digital broadcasts!

I can't imagine that most people care that much about clarity that they would spend \$500 to \$1,000 to buy a new TV that has a digital, as opposed to an analog signal! Who cares!! They would only do so if they were FORCED to do so by the stations. And are you sure that they aren't in cahoots with some manufacturing firm that just wants to sell more TVs?

If the government lets the TV stations have something for free, which is potentially worth billions to the taxpayers, then the government should provide every household with a free 35" TV!!!!

Of course, they never would. The answer to this dilemma? The government should STOP giving multi-billion dollar corporations FREE airwaves. Sell them to the highest bidder and put that money towards the federal deficit!!!!

The notion that these corporations are providing a greatly needed public service (by force feeding us THEIR version of the news) is ludicrous. Case in point: why did it take 30 years to provide Americans with the truth about the Kennedy assassination - and then, we had to learn it through a Hollywood producer, not through the corporate broadcast stations!!!

There's nothing in the Constitution that provides Americans with free use of entertainment. If taking away free airwaves from TV Stations forces free broadcasting to Americans to become obsolete, then so be it! Americans, especially children, would be better off! All this violence on TV just feeds and breeds more violence.

IF the TV stations want to change their method of broadcasting, let them - AFTER they purchase the airwaves. Then, they can do what ever they want with their paid-for signal. And if Americans want to receive these new signals, let them purchase their new TV sets.

I personally do not like watching TV on the big 35" screens: it hurts your eyes because living rooms are generally small and you're too close to the set.
Also, I feel that the radiation that emanates from the TV would not be safe coming from a big set being too close to the viewers.

I, for one, do not have cable, nor do I intend to get it. If TV ceases to be free, I will stop watching it - it isn't worth watching if you have to pay for it anyway (which is why so many people have cable in the first place). I'd be happy to see TV eliminated from most homes. It is not an asset to our lives.

Please stop this "welfare" to giant corporations!

Thank you.

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

MM 87 268

From: Michael A. McGlaughlin <mmcglaughlin@crow.bmc.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/17/96 12:05pm
Subject: TV channel sales

JAN 19 1996

17Jan96
3122 Misty Brook Lane
Houston, TX 77084

Dear Sirs:

I would like to express my opinion that the nation's TV, radio, etc. media channels should be sold to raise funds and not given away.

Also, that TV stations should carry both analog and digital broadcasts if at all possible. If not, then converter boxes for digital signals should be readily available and inexpensive. Also, any phase-out of analog signals should be at least 20 years in the future.

Sincerely,
Michael A. McGlaughlin

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

MM 87-268

JAN 19 1996

From: Jesse Hord <72247.2031@compuserve.com>
To: FCC <fccinfo@fcc.gov>
Date: 1/16/96 11:21pm
Subject: RE/HDTV

I read an article (authored by Frank Greven of Knight-Ridder News Service) in the daily newspaper this morning ...the topic was HDTV. I've heard relatively little about this topic in the news media in the last few years. Now it appears the Broadcasters are anxious to embark on the HDTV transition. While I am receptive to advances in technology and sharper video images, the article left me somewhat cool to the idea. The two most glaring points that I extracted from the writeup were that the homeowner's TV receiver would likely cost in the neighborhood of \$4000 (at least initially) and that one would need a 35-inch (or larger) set to be able to appreciate the improved digital image quality. A RED

FLAG goes up! My humble initial reaction is that this proposal may not be in the best interests of the mainstream consumer and should be publicly aired and debated before it is enacted.

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

From: david kahl <dakahl@entertain.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/16/96 1:01pm
Subject: HDTV

JAN 19 1996

To: Mr. Reed E. Hundt, Chairman, FCC

Dear Mr. Hunt:

I am sending this message to express my opposition to the HDTV proposal being promoted by the broadcasting industry. I am very opposed to their notion that they should be given free spectrum for this use. In a time when we are struggling to find a way to balance the budget, cutting budgets on essential programs, we should not be giving away any public resources to private industry. The auctions for available channels should continue.

Personally, I am not interested in the improved picture quality touted by HDPE, and I am definitely not interested in being forced to buy a new television set or converter device to accomodate this proposed new "service". I will cancel my cable service and buy an antenna instead.

I am tired and disillusioned by the continuing dominance of huge corporations, industries and lobby groups in establishing self-serving federal policies and regulations, to the detriment of the general public. Please accept my strong opposition to the broadcasting industry's HDTV proposals, and help us bring the government back to a position where it actually serves its citizens best interests.

Dave Kahl	D. A. Kahl Consulting
email: dakahl@abwam.com	1025 Miami Way
phone: (303)494-0167	Boulder, CO 80303
fax: (303) 494-8606	

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

MM-87-268

From: <Bkrcove@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/16/96 4:14am
Subject: To: FCC, Reed Hundt.

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996

RE: digital television bandwidth auction/giveaway/ownership

Mr. Hundt,

I am writing you regarding some disturbing news which has recently come to my attention.

As you are doubtless busy, and have (I hope) received many letters on this topic I will get straight to the point:

From what I hear the Federal Government (in particular the FCC and the U.S.

Congress) are seriously considering actions that would allow the network television industry FREE use of not only the public air-waves which they currently use, but also of an additional block of at least equal size. In other words, no only do they want what they've got, but TWICE as much, and they don't want to pay anything for it?

As a member of the public (and therefore part owner of this public bandwidth) I wish to express my opinion on this issue. My opinion is simply: NO!

In my opinion network television should be made to pay for public bandwidth at auction just as other individuals and organizations are required to pay for use of other public resources. Not only should networks pay for the addition bandwidth they seek, but they should be required, henceforth, to pay for the bandwidth they currently use. That they were initially allowed to use this bandwidth freely was reasonable at a time when television was a frontier technology, but those days are LONG past.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Brian K. Retke; Computer Consultant; Sterling, IL.

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

From: <Bkrcove@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/16/96 4:14am
Subject: To: FCC, Reed Hundt.

MM 87-268

JAN 19 1996

RE: digital television bandwidth auction/giveaway/ownership

Mr. Hundt,

I am writing you regarding some disturbing news which has recently come to my attention.

As you are doubtless busy, and have (I hope) received many letters on this topic I will get straight to the point:

From what I hear the Federal Government (in particular the FCC and the U.S.

Congress) are seriously considering actions that would allow the network television industry FREE use of not only the public air-waves which they currently use, but also of an additional block of at least equal size. In other words, no only do they want what they've got, but TWICE as much, and they don't want to pay anything for it?

As a member of the public (and therefore part owner of this public bandwidth) I wish to express my opinion on this issue. My opinion is simply: NO!

In my opinion network television should be made to pay for public bandwidth at auction just as other individuals and organizations are required to pay for use of other public resources. Not only should networks pay for the addition bandwidth they seek, but they should be required, henceforth, to pay for the bandwidth they currently use. That they were initially allowed to use this bandwidth freely was reasonable at a time when television was a frontier technology, but those days are LONG past.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Brian K. Retke; Computer Consultant; Sterling, IL.

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

MM 87-268

From: E.O. Oakley <EOAKLEY@WPO.HCC.COM>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/15/96 4:31pm
Subject: Broadcast TV's future

JAN 19 1996

Dear Sir:

In the Sunday edition of the Charlotte Observer in Charlotte, NC, Mr. Frank Greve, Observer Washington Bureau wrote an article entitled "The Great TV robbery".

I would like to respond and also give my opinion to that article.

I have followed the development of digital HDTV for many years. Mr. Greve's opinion that nobody will be able to tell the difference unless they have a new 35" TV is just flat wrong. All one has to do is visit Europe to see what new standards

(not even HDTV) can do. Additionally the money to be spent (as quoted by Mr. Greve) \$187 billion is also incorrect in that the vast majority of the existing analog TV's will have to be replaced by the 15 year transition period anyway, plus the cost of digital HDTV's will dramatically drop as do all commodity electronic products.

Having said that, Mr. Greve did make some excellent points concerning the cost and transition. However, no matter who pays initially the only true payer is the American public because networks, advertisers, and government all ultimately charge the public.

The real disturbing portion is that we seem to have lost the ability or desire to have two different viewpoints sit down and work out what is best for the USA. Both sides distort the facts and try to emotionally excite the public so that they do not know who or what to believe. This is one of the reasons that we have (still) one of the oldest and most outdated TV systems in the world while most of the world enjoys much better quality TV. I know I have lived in Europe for two years.

So my plea is for the broadcast companies, the government, and people like Mr. Greve to sit down and earnestly try to work out what is best for the American public.

Respectfully submitted,
E. O. Oakley
3409 Quail Ridge Lane
Matthews, NC 28105

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

From: <gordona@admin.winthrop.edu>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/15/96 11:32am
Subject: TV Robber Barons

MM 87-268
JAN 19 1996

Dear Mr. Hundt--I am opposed to the government giveaway of airwave channels and the change to digital signals that will make current TVs obsolete. If broadcasters wish to change from analog to digital, consumers should be given a choice or at least provided with free or subsidized adapter technology. I find it appalling that our government continues to virtually give away our natural resources to big business interests; now they want to continue to placate such interests in the media at the public's expense. April Gordon

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

From: <NickNY@aol.com>
To: A4.A4(FCCinfo)
Date: 1/15/96 10:45am
Subject: Digital Broadcasting

To whom it may concern,

It has come to my attention that there is a movement among broadcasters to change from analog to digital broadcasting. The resulting expense to the consumer is prohibitive. The estimate I received predicted a cost of 1500 dollars to each consumer that wishes to replace the receiver in their home. The new system is not compatible with the old and would necessitate replacing the home receiver.

#1. The air waves belong to the people of this country. Even if they are regulated by the government, this regulation is done on the behalf of the people.

#2. It has long been the practice of the FCC to require the compatibility of any new system to the existing system.

#3. The cost of this change over, which is obviously a move on the part of commercial endeavors to improve their product and therefore their profits, should not be the burden of the American public.

I think it is the duty of the FCC to represent the American Public in this matter. I, personally, am not prepared to have my present equipment made obsolete.

Thank you for your attention

RECEIVED
JAN 19 1996
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE SECRETARY

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

JAN 19 1996

From: Philip Krastman <pgkrastman@nmaa.org>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/14/96 11:20pm
Subject: Sub.Television obsolete???

Dear Reed E. Hundt Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission:

I have recent advice that the FCC is backing legislation before the Congress that would obsolete the present TV NTSC transmission format in favour of a new digital format. The owners of present TV transmission frequencies would, as proposed, get more and newly revised bandwidth for free with little to no royalties to the American Tax-payer and US citizens. I object to such proposals, speaking as a citizen, voter, & tax-payer. If digital HDTV is to be put in effect, then the proponents of it should be required to make free TV format converter boxes available to all US Tax-payers who request them.

Such boxes shall be payed for by the manufactuers of the new Digital TV's and the TV stations transmitting such signals. I feel Digital TV is ripe for the time, but I do not feel that the US citizen can afford to pay for this luxury during the present depression that the working US citizen is in.

If this would help the US electronics/ manufacturing (non-existant) industry, then it would be good. As an out of work US Electrical Engineer, I feel that the HDTV systems as presently proposed will profit Japanese, Chinese, and other pacific rim countries, not to also mention Thompson (European)

Electronics Co. Sincerely, Phil Krastman pgkrastman@nmaa.org

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

JAN 19 1996

From: <DADuclos@aol.com>
To: FCCMAIL.SMTP("mel watt@hr.house.gov","chtaylor@hr....
Date: 1/14/96 1:39pm
Subject: fcc giveaway

dear congressman please dont allow the fcc to giveaway our rights to the airways to broadcasters. do not let the national association of broadcasters lobby sway your thinking in this matter. at least let the government auction of the tv channels and apply the money so obtained to the national debt. also dont let it go cheaply.

donald a. duclos
3635 wandering lane ne hickory, nc 28601

please advise my congressmen of my wishes since they have not become enlightened enough to have internet addresses. thanks dad

CC: A4.A4(fccinfo)

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE _____

MM 87-268

From: Edwin Miller <MILLERE@herndon.bytex.network.com>
To: 'FCC' <fccinfo@fcc.gov>
Date: 1/11/96 5:41pm
Subject: HDTV Spectrum Auction

JAN 19 1996

To: FCC; Hundt, Reed
Date: 1/11/96

Mr. Hundt,

I recently read an article in my local newspaper stating that the network television industry wants a greater part (larger band-width) of the electromagnetic spectrum for free so that they can go to digital TV transmissions.

I think that the television industry should be forced to pay for their share of the HDTV spectrum. The channels should be auctioned off at regular intervals.

TV content is disgusting to me, far from being a public service in any way, shape or form; those who profit from it could at least help shoulder the load that taxpayers toil under.

No. of Copies rec'd 1
List ABCDE

MM 87-268

From: <east@shellus.com>
To: A4.A4(fccinfo)
Date: 1/11/96 1:22pm
Subject: HDTV Digital Television comments

JAN 19 1996

Mr. Hundt,

After reading a newspaper article in arecent issue of the Houston Chronicle by a Knight-Ridder Tribune News reporter, I just wanted to pass on my SHORT comment on how one consumer feels about the HDTV issue.

The reporters article read more like an editorial, so it probably didn't belong on in the business section of the paper. The reporter's position was centered on the idea that the public would be better served by charging the TV broadcast industry for the additional frequency space necessary during the period when both analog and digital formats are being broadcasted by local stations. The reporter obviously feels that all consumers support his position that the monies collected through auctions would be a wind-fall for the taxpayer, and that the only reason some might consider making these additional frequencies temporarily available to the stations without charge is the pressure of lawyers and lobbyists in Washington. It is my assertion that any fees collected through such an auction would be passed on to the consumer through higher rates to advertisers, and then higher prices for the products these advertiser sell. I can't see how this would be in my best interest.

As a consumer, I am well aware of the need for me to replace my existing television equipment to support this new technology. However, I have been looking forward to HDTV technology for more than 3 years now... postponing any purchases of the older technology. I want the new, higher quality images. I'm willing to pay more for it, but I'd rather not pay more for both the set and the programming. Any additional fees your office might impose will certainly get passed on to me eventually.... so that's my vote (for what ever it's worth).

Although I am fully aware of the difficulties your office faces with ever increasing demands on the available frequency space, it is my understanding that the existing frequencies used for analog broadcast would be returned following a reasonable transition period during which both analog and digital broadcasts would be required.

Sincerely,

Tom East
Technology Development, Technology Services
Shell Services Company
1500 Old Spanish Trail, Room 7B10
Houston, Texas 77054 voice: (713) 245-1236 fax: (713) 245-3107 email: east@shellus.com

NOTE: The comments and opinions expressed above are my own, and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of my company or management.

No. of Copies rec'd _____
List ABCDE